Galaxy phase-space density data exclude Bose-Einstein condensate Axion Dark Matter

H. J. de Vega [(a,b)*] **and N. G. Sanchez** [(b)†]

[(a)] *LPTHE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris VI), Sorbonne Universités, Laboratoire Associé au CNRS UMR 7589, Tour 24, 4ème. et 5ème. étage, Boite 126, 4, Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris, Cedex 05, France.*

[(b)] *Observatoire de Paris, LERMA. Laboratoire Associé au CNRS UMR 8112. 61, Avenue de l'Observatoire, 75014 Paris, France.*

(Dated: November 19, 2014)

Light scalars (as the axion) with mass $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV forming a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) exhibit a Jeans length in the kpc scale and were therefore proposed as dark matter (DM) candidates. Our treatment here is generic, independent of the particle physics model and applies to all DM BEC, in or out of equilibrium. Two observed quantities crucially constrain DM in an inescapable way: the average DM density ρ_{DM} and the phase-space density Q. The observed values of ρ_{DM} and Q in galaxies today, constrain both the possibility to form a BEC and the DM mass m. These two constraints robustly exclude axion DM that decouples just after the QCD phase transition. Moreover, the value $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV can only be obtained with a number of ultrarelativistic degrees of freedom at decoupling in the trillions which is impossible for decoupling in the radiation dominated era. In addition, we find for the axion vacuum misalignment scenario that axions are produced strongly out of thermal equilibrium and that the axion mass in such scenario turns to be 17 orders of magnitude too large to reproduce the observed galactic structures. Moreover, we also consider inhomogenous gravitationally bounded BEC's supported by the bosonic quantum pressure independently of any particular particle physics scenario. For a typical size $R \sim$ kpc and compact object masses $M \sim 10^7\ M_\odot$they remarkably lead to the same particle mass $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV as the BEC free-streaming length. However, the phase-space density for the gravitationally bounded BEC's turns to be more than sixty orders of magnitude smaller than the galaxy observed values. We conclude that the BEC's and the axion cannot be the DM particle. However, an axion in the mili-eV scale may be a relevant source of dark energy through the zero point cosmological quantum fluctuations.

arXiv:1401.1214v2 [astro-ph.CO] 18 Nov 2014

Deciphering the nature of dark matter (DM) is nowadays one of the most active domains in astrophysics, cosmology and particle physics. DM particles with mass m below the eV (HDM-hot DM) are ruled out because their too large Jeans lengths exclude the formation of the observed galaxies. There is a way out for scalar particles if they form Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC) where the Jeans length can be estimated as [1, 2]

$$\lambda_J \sim 4\,\sqrt{\frac{10^{-22}\ \text{eV}}{m}}\ \text{kpc} \simeq 1.2\times 10^{17}\,\sqrt{\frac{10^{-22}\ \text{eV}}{m}}\ \text{km}\ . \tag{1}$$

Hence, in BEC dark matter one should have

$$m \sim 10^{-22}\ \text{eV} \tag{2}$$

in order to reproduce the observed galactic structures. The same requirement but for non-BEC dark matter gives m in the keV scale, that is warm dark matter [3].

BEC of alkali atoms, BEC of molecules and BEC of magnons have been observed experimentally in the laboratory [4].

After decoupling, the DM distribution function f_d freezes out and is a function of the covariant momentum p. We consider generic distribution functions out of thermal equilibrium or thermal. The specific form of f_d in the non-thermal cases depends on the details of the interactions before decoupling. Our treatment applies to any shape of f_d and is valid for any particle physics model. For convenience and without losing generality, we choose f_d as a function of $p/T_d:\ f_d(p/T_d)$, where T_d is the covariant decoupling temperature.

In a BEC a sizeable fraction of the particles is in the zero momentum state while the rest is on excited states. We call ρ_0 the zero-momentum comoving contribution to the mass density. The contribution from the excited states $\rho - \rho_0$ follows as usual by integrating the distribution function. When the particles became nonrelativistic, we thus

*Electronic address: Corresponding Author: devega@lpthe.jussieu.fr

†Electronic address: Norma.Sanchez@obspm.fr

have

$$\rho - \rho_0 = m \int_0^\infty \frac{p^2\, dp}{2\,\pi^2} f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right) = \frac{m}{2\,\pi^2}\, T_d^3\, U \quad , \quad U \equiv \int_0^\infty y^2\, f_d(y)\, dy \, , \tag{3}$$

where we consider neutral scalars. The case where the particles remain UR is considered in eq.(24) below.

The BEC density ρ_0 vanishes at the BEC covariant critical temperature T_c. Therefore, the BEC can be present if $T_d < T_c$ and we have from eq.(3) [5],

$$\rho = \frac{m\, U}{2\,\pi^2}\, T_c^3 \quad , \quad \rho_0 = \frac{m\, U}{2\,\pi^2}\, \left(T_c^3 - T_d^3\right) \quad , \quad T_d < T_c \, . \tag{4}$$

[T_c is defined by the above equation even in the out of thermal equilibrium case]. T_d and T_c are related to the respective effective number of UR degrees of freedom g_d and g_c, and to the photon temperature today T_γ by entropy conservation [6]:

$$T_c = \left(\frac{2}{g_c}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\, T_\gamma \, , \quad T_d = \left(\frac{2}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\, T_\gamma \, , \quad T_\gamma = 0.2348\, 10^{-3}\text{eV} \, . \tag{5}$$

The DM density ρ must reproduce the observed average DM in the universe $\Omega_{DM}\, \rho_{\rm crit}$. Hence,

$$\rho_{\rm DM} \equiv \Omega_{DM}\, \rho_{\rm crit} = \frac{m\, U}{\pi^2\, g_d}\, \left(\frac{T_c}{T_d}\right)^3\, T_\gamma^3 \quad , \quad \rho_{\rm DM} = 0.9259\, 10^{-23}\, \text{keV}^4 \, . \tag{6}$$

Therefore, the DM particle mass m can be related to T_d/T_c as

$$m = \pi^2\, \frac{\rho_{DM}\, g_d}{T_\gamma^3\, U}\, \left(\frac{T_d}{T_c}\right)^3 = 7.059\ \text{eV}\, \frac{g_d}{U}\, \left(\frac{T_d}{T_c}\right)^3 \, . \tag{7}$$

The value of g_d depends on the detailed particle physics of the light scalar particle. For QCD axions decoupling soon after the QCD phase transition one has $g_d \sim 25$. The covariant critical temperature T_c as well as g_c are parameters that depend on the BEC state. It must be $g_c < g_d$ (and hence $T_d < T_c$) in order to have a BEC.

The continuous and bounded function $f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)$ stands for the excited states of the distribution function. The total distribution function can be written as a Dirac delta function representing the zero momentum BEC plus the excited states piece $f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)$ as follows

$$f_d^{total}(p) = (2\,\pi)^3\, \frac{\rho_0}{m}\, \delta\left(\vec{p}\right) + f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right) = 2\,\pi^2\, \frac{\rho_0}{m}\, \frac{\delta(p^2)}{p^2} + f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right) \tag{8}$$

The continuum Dirac delta notation is convenient for calculations but in reality the BEC is in a finite comoving volume V_c and the wavenumbers $\vec{p}$ are discretized:

$$\vec{p} = \frac{2\,\pi}{V_c^{\frac{1}{3}}}\, \vec{n} \quad , \quad \vec{n}\, \epsilon\, \mathcal{Z}^3 \quad , \quad \delta\left(\vec{p}\right) = \frac{V_c}{(2\,\pi)^3}\, \delta_{\vec{p},\vec{0}} \, .$$

Therefore, $\delta\left(\vec{0}\right) = \frac{V_c}{(2\,\pi)^3}$ is finite as well as $f_d^{total}(0)$:

$$f_d^{total}(0) = \frac{\rho_0}{m}\, V_c + f_d(0) \, .$$

The comoving squared velocity $< v^2 >$ can be then expressed as

$$< v^2 > = \frac{< p^2 >}{m^2} = \frac{1}{m^2}\, \frac{\int_0^\infty \frac{p^4\, dp}{2\,\pi^2} f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)}{\frac{\rho_0}{m} + \int_0^\infty \frac{p^2\, dp}{2\,\pi^2}\, f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)} = \frac{T_d^5}{m^2\, T_c^3}\, \frac{V}{U} \quad , \quad V \equiv \int_0^\infty y^4\, f_d(y)\, dy \, . \tag{9}$$

The BEC does not contribute to the integral in the numerator of $< v^2 >$ in eq.(9) because the integral of the Dirac delta function in f_d^{total} eq.(8) vanishes upon integration over $\vec{p}$ due to the extra p^2 factor in the numerator of eq.(9) with respect to the denominator.

As noticed in ref. [5] the Bose-Einstein distribution, for massless particles is of the order of the comoving volume V_c as discussed above. The BEC distribution function is well defined. This is also the case for massive particles because the chemical potential at decoupling μ_d must be equal to the particle mass m in order to form a BEC [5]. Even the part of the distribution function that describes the particles outside the condensate is of the order of V_c. So, the two pieces of the total distribution function: the BEC part and the excited states part $f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)$ are of the order of the comoving volume V_c which in this case is very small. This is so because for the QCD phase transition $g_d \sim 25$ and $(z_d + 1) \sim 1.7\ 10^{12}$, giving for V_c,

$$V_c = \frac{V_{today}}{(z_d + 1)^3} \sim 2 \times 10^{-37}\ V_{today}\ . \tag{10}$$

Taking for example $V_{today}^{1/3} = 1$ kpc, yields $V_c^{1/3} \sim 18200$ km.

Let us discuss now the phase space density which is defined by:

$$Q \equiv \frac{\rho}{< \sigma^2 >^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \sqrt{27}\ \frac{\rho}{< v^2 >^{\frac{3}{2}}}\ = \sqrt{27}\ \frac{m^3\ \rho}{\left\langle \vec{P}_f^2 \right\rangle^{\frac{3}{2}}}\ , \tag{11}$$

where $\sigma^2 =< v^2 > /3$ is the velocity dispersion, and $\vec{P}_f$ is the physical momentum.

Including explicitly the BEC, using eqs.(4) and (9), the phase space density Q eq.(11) is given by

$$Q = \sqrt{27}\ m^3\ \frac{\left[\frac{\rho_0}{m} + \int_0^\infty \frac{p^2\ dp}{2\ \pi^2}\ f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)\right]^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\left[\int_0^\infty \frac{p^4\ dp}{2\ \pi^2} f_d\left(\frac{p}{T_d}\right)\right]^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \frac{3\ \sqrt{3}}{2\ \pi^2}\ m^4\ \frac{U^{\frac{5}{2}}}{V^{\frac{3}{2}}}\ \left(\frac{T_c}{T_d}\right)^{\frac{15}{2}}\ . \tag{12}$$

In the absence of self-gravity Q is Liouville invariant since both ρ and $\left\langle \vec{P}_f^2 \right\rangle^{\frac{3}{2}}$ redshift as $(z + 1)^3$. Since the distribution function is frozen and is a solution of the collisionless Boltzmann (Liouville) equation, it is clear that Q is a *constant*, namely a Liouville invariant, in the absence of self-gravity [5]. The value of Q given by eq.(12) is valid after decoupling and before structure formation when Q is invariant under the universe expansion.

The definition of Q eq.(11) provides fine-grained as well as coarse- grained expressions for Q . This is so because averaging the fine-grained expressions yields the corresponding coarse-grained Q which keeps an identical expression. Therefore, eq.(11) provides an appropriate coarse-grained phase-space density Q. The phase-space density expressions eq.(11) are always valid: in the primordial universe where it is constant as well as afterwards in the presence of self-gravity when structure formation occurs.

Tremaine and Gunn [7] argued that the value of the coarse grained phase space density is always smaller than, or equal to, the maximum value of the (fine grained) microscopic phase space density, which is the distribution function. Such argument relies on the theorem that states that the coarse grained phase space density can only diminish by collisionless phase mixing or violent relaxation by gravitational dynamics [10]. A similar argument was presented by Dalcanton and Hogan [8], and confirmed by numerical studies.

Since the phase-space density Q is a *constant* in the absence of self-gravity, and Q can only **decrease** by collisionless phase mixing or self-gravity dynamics [7–10], Q^{-1} behaves as an entropy that can only increase or stay constant during the universe expansion. Therefore, necessarily :

$$Q_{\rm today} \leq Q\ , \quad \text{where} \quad Q_{\rm today} \equiv \frac{Q}{Z} \tag{13}$$

being $Z \geq 1$ a numerical constant (the decreasing factor). The value of $Q_{\rm today}$ can be computed with galaxy data today for ρ and $< \sigma^2 >$, namely

$$Q_{\rm today} = \frac{\rho_{\rm today}}{< \sigma^2_{\rm today} >^{\frac{3}{2}}} \tag{14}$$

Normally, ρ and σ^2 are averaged over the galaxy core. $Q_{\rm today}$ has been well measured by different galaxy observations and it is galaxy dependent. $Q_{\rm today}$ is the largest for ultracompact dwarf galaxies and the smallest for large and dilute spiral galaxies [11]. From the compilation of well established sets of galaxy data in Table 1 of ref. [12] we have

$$5\times 10^{-6} < \left(\frac{Q_{\rm today}}{\rm keV^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} < 1.4\ . \tag{15}$$

Now, from eqs.(7) and (12) we express m and T_d/T_c in terms of Q, U and V with the result:

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \frac{2^{\frac{2}{3}}}{3\,\pi^2}\,V\,Q^{\frac{2}{3}}\,\frac{T_\gamma^5}{(\rho_{DM}\ g_d)^{\frac{5}{3}}} = 44.62\ {\rm keV}\ \left(\frac{Q}{\rm keV^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}\ V\ , \\ \left(\frac{T_d}{T_c}\right)^3 &= \frac{2^{\frac{2}{3}}}{3\,\pi^4}\,U\,V\,\frac{T_\gamma^8}{(\rho_{DM}\ g_d)^{\frac{8}{3}}}\,Q^{\frac{2}{3}} = 248.43\ \left(\frac{Q}{\rm keV^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\ U\ V\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{8}{3}}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$g_d\sim 25$ corresponds to DM decoupling just after the QCD phase transition as it is the case for axions.

For decoupling at thermal equilibrium (TE) we have from eqs.(3) and (9), $U^{TE}=2\,\zeta(3)=2.404114$, $V^{TE}=24\,\zeta(5)=24.88627$ and eq.(16) yields

$$\frac{T_d}{T_c} = 24.58709\ \left(\frac{Q}{\rm keV^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{9}}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{8}{9}}\quad ,\quad m = 1.110\ {\rm MeV}\ \left(\frac{Q}{\rm keV^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}\quad {\rm TE}\ . \tag{17}$$

Therefore, from eqs.(17) and (15) the condition $Q\geq Q_{\rm today}$ implies

$$\frac{T_d}{T_c} \geq 27\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{8}{9}}\quad ,\quad m\geq 1.55\ {\rm MeV}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}\quad ,\quad {\rm TE}\ . \tag{18}$$

We see that for $g_d\sim 25$, is always $T_d > T_c$ and hence **no BEC forms for TE decoupling**.

If one requires a BEC be formed, namely $T_d\leq T_c$, eq.(18) yields for g_d a very large value

$$g_d\geq 1020\quad ,\quad {\rm BEC,\ TE}\ . \tag{19}$$

This requires particle models possesing a **huge number** of particle states and where DM decouples **well above** the electroweak scale. Recall that at the TeV scale in the standard model of particle physics, $g_d\sim 100$ [6]. In addition, for $g_d=1020$, eq.(18) yields

$$m > 3.21\ {\rm keV}\quad ,\quad {\rm BEC,\ TE}\ . \tag{20}$$

For **decoupling out of TE** we recall that typically, thermalization is reached by the mixing of the particle modes and the scattering between particles which redistribute the particles in phase space: the higher momentum modes are populated by a *cascade* whose wave front moves towards the ultraviolet region akin to a direct cascade in turbulence, leaving in its wake a state of nearly local TE but with a temperature lower than that of equilibrium [13]. Hence, when the dark matter particles at decoupling are not yet at thermodynamical equilibrium, their momentum distribution is expected to be peaked at smaller momenta than in the TE case since the ultraviolet cascade is not yet completed [13]. Therefore, the distribution function at decoupling out of TE can be written as

$$f_d^{out\ TE}(p) = \frac{f_0}{e^{\frac{p}{\xi\,T_d}}-1}\ \theta(p^0-p)\ , \tag{21}$$

where $\xi=1$ at TE and $\xi\lesssim 1$ before thermodynamical equilibrium is attained. $f_0\sim 1$ is a normalization factor and p^0 cuts the spectrum in the ultraviolet region not yet reached by the cascade. These features and the distribution function out of TE are generic and universal, the result is unique irrespective of the different ways the bosons forming a BEC can be out of TE, because the formation of a BEC is a unique process requiring one universal condition $T_d\leq T_c$.

The distribution function eq.(21) yields for U and V through eqs.(3) and (9),

$$U^{out\ TE} = f_0\ \xi^3\ U(s)\ , \quad V^{out\ TE} = f_0\ \xi^5\ V(s)\ , \quad s \equiv \frac{p^0}{\xi\ T_d}\ ,$$

$$U(s) \equiv \int_0^s \frac{y^2\ dy}{e^y - 1} \quad , \quad V(s) \equiv \int_0^s \frac{y^4\ dy}{e^y - 1}\ .$$

Then, from eq.(16) the condition $Q \geq Q_{\rm today}$ implies for **decoupling out of TE**:

$$m \geq 44.62\ {\rm keV}\ \left(\frac{Q_{\rm today}}{{\rm keV}^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}\ V^{out\ TE} = 1.110\ {\rm MeV}\ \left(\frac{Q_{\rm today}}{{\rm keV}^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}\ f_0\ \xi^5\ \frac{V(s)}{V(\infty)} \quad ,$$
$$\left(\frac{T_d}{T_c}\right)^3 \geq 1.48635\ 10^4\ \left(\frac{Q_{\rm today}}{{\rm keV}^4}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\ f_0^2\ \xi^8\ \frac{U(s)\ V(s)}{U(\infty)\ V(\infty)} \quad , \quad \text{out of TE}\ . \tag{22}$$

Typically, out of TE we have $s = \mathcal{O}(1),\ f_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $U(1)/U(\infty) = 0.147\ ,\ V(1)/V(\infty) = 0.00658$. From the bound eq.(22) the limiting condition $T_d \sim T_c$ for the presence of a BEC is satisfied for $s \sim 1,\ \xi \sim 0.7,\ f_0 \sim 1$. As a consequence, we find in the BEC limiting case of decoupling out of TE,

$$T_d \sim T_c\ ,\ f_0\ \xi^5\ \frac{V(s)}{V(\infty)} \sim 10^{-3}\ ,\ m \geq 14\ {\rm eV}\ \left(\frac{25}{g_d}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}} \quad , \quad BEC \quad \text{out of TE}\ . \tag{23}$$

We conclude that:

- BEC DM decoupling at thermal equilibrium requires a particle model with a **huge number** $g_d \geq 1020$ of particle states ultrarelativistic at DM decoupling [eq.(19)]. For $g_d = 1020$ the particle mass must be $m > 3$ keV [eq.(20)], that is, **twenty-five orders of magnitude larger** than the appropriate BEC mass value eq.(2).
- BEC DM decoupling out of thermal equilibrium requires for $g_d \sim 25$ a particle mass m of at least 14 eV [eq.(23)]. That is, at least **twenty-three orders of magnitude larger** than the appropriate BEC mass value eq.(2).

From eq.(1) the Jeans lengths corresponding to the above cases eqs.(20) and (23) are:

$$\lambda_J({\rm keV}) = 2.2 \times 10^4\ {\rm km} \quad \text{for TE}\ ,$$

$$\lambda_J(10\ {\rm eV}) = 3.9 \times 10^6\ {\rm km} \quad \text{for out of TE}\ .$$

These values are **unrealistically small** by eleven to thirteen orders of magnitude [see eq.(1)] in order to form the observed galaxy structures. Namely, DM structures of **all** sizes above these minuscule Jeans lengths will be formed in contradiction with astronomical observations. These values are even worse than the cold DM Jeans length which is $\sim 3 \times 10^{12}$ km. Therefore, BEC particle masses compatible with the DM average density and the DM galaxy phase-space density constraints, namely $m > 3$ keV (TE) and $m > 14$ eV (out of TE), have **exceedingly small** Jeans lengths, results which strongly disfavour BEC DM.

If one requires the DM BEC particle to take the mass value eq.(2) appropriate for galaxy structures, one finds from eqs.(18) and (23) that g_d must take the values

$$g_d \sim 2 \times 10^{11} \quad \text{TE} \quad , \quad g_d \sim 2 \times 10^{14} \quad \text{out of TE}\ .$$

These gigantic values of g_d are totally impossible for decoupling in the radiation dominated era.

In the case DM stays ultrarelativistic till today, eq.(4) for the DM density becomes

$$\rho = \frac{T_c^4}{2\ \pi^2}\ W \quad , \quad W \equiv \int_0^\infty y^3\ f_d(y)\ dy\ . \tag{24}$$

This equation is valid both in the BEC case and in the absence of a BEC. For out of thermal equilibrium decoupling we have from eq.(21) that $W^{out\ TE} < W^{TE} = \pi^4/15$. We thus obtain from eqs.(5) and (24), $g_d^{TE} = 0.4443 > g_d^{out\ TE}$.

This equation **cannot** be satisfied since it must always be $g_d \geq 2$ due to the existence of the photon. Therefore, scalar particles which are ultrarelativistic today cannot describe the DM.

The treatment we presented here is **independent** of the particle physics model describing the DM particle and applies to all DM BEC. All the results found here only follow from the gravitational interaction of the particles, their bosonic nature and the robust DM observational constraints from the average DM density ρ_{DM} and the DM phase-space density Q.

So far, we have here considered homogeneous BEC i.e. a BEC in all the space. Gravitationally bounded BEC's with a finite size R can also exist.That is to say, a two phase situation in which the BEC is inside the radius R and the normal phase is outside. This gravitationally bounded BEC can be considered as the final stationary state, dynamically produced by a gravitational BEC phase transition. The results provided by this gravitational BEC study are robust irrespective of any particular particle physics model. A gravitationally bounded object formed by a BEC can be obtained by equating the bosonic quantum pressure and the gravitational pressure.

The BEC quantum pressure is the flux of the quantum momentum, $P_Q = n\ v\ p$, p being the minimum momentum from the Heinsenberg principle $p \sim \hbar/R$ and $n = \rho/m$ is the number density of particles. Therefore,

$$P_Q = \rho\ \left(\frac{\hbar}{R\ m}\right)^2 = \frac{3}{4\ \pi}\ \frac{\hbar^2\ M}{R^5\ m^2}\ , \tag{25}$$

where $\rho = (3\ M)/(4\ \pi\ R^3)$ and M is the mass of the BEC.

For an object of radius R and mass M the gravitational pressure is

$$P_G = \frac{G\ M^2}{4\ \pi\ R^4}\ . \tag{26}$$

Thus, $P_Q = P_G$ implies for the BEC size R,

$$R = \frac{3}{G\ M}\ \left(\frac{\hbar}{m}\right)^2 = 2.861\ 10^{-36}\ \frac{M_\odot}{M}\ \left(\frac{\text{eV}}{m}\right)^2\ \hbar\ \text{kpc}\ . \tag{27}$$

The DM particle mass becomes from eq.(27)

$$m = 5.349\ 10^{-22}\ \text{eV}\ \sqrt{\frac{10^7\ M_\odot}{M}\ \frac{\text{kpc}}{R}}\ . \tag{28}$$

That is, for a typical compact BEC object of kpc size and mass $M \sim 10^7\ M_\odot$ we obtain the BEC DM particle mass in agreement with eq.(2). This remarkable result shows the consistency of the self-gravitating BEC quantum estimate eq.(25)-(27) with the BEC free-streaming length eq.(2).

The phase space density $Q = \rho/\sigma^3$ can be estimated following similar lines as above, namely

$$Q = \sqrt{27}\ \rho\ \left(\frac{m\ R}{\hbar}\right)^3 = \frac{\sqrt{27}}{4\ \pi}\ \left(\frac{m}{\hbar}\right)^3\ M\ , \tag{29}$$

with the result

$$\frac{Q}{\text{keV}^4} = 0.461\ 10^{-68}\ \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22}\ \text{eV}}\right)^3\ \left(\frac{M}{10^7\ M_\odot}\right)\ .$$

BEC objects would correspond to compact halos ie typically M about $10^7\ M_\odot$, thus $Q \sim 10^{-68}$ for the typical $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV. That is, more than sixty orders of magnitude smaller than the observed values eq.(15). Although $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV provides reasonable BEC free-streaming lengths [eq.(2)], the corresponding BEC phase-space density turns to be ridiculously small.

Notice that the value eq.(29) is a **maximal** value for Q as evaluated from the minimum saturated quantum value of the momentum using the Heisenberg principle.

The main DM candidate for a scalar particle forming a BEC condensate is the axion [14, 15]. In the usual scenario of DM axions, axions decouple soon after the QCD phase transition ($g_d \sim 25$) and then they are assumed (i) to become nonrelativistic, (ii) to thermalize and (iii) to form a BEC [2]. (Ref. [17] recently criticized this scenario). Hence, the bound eq.(18) clearly shows that no DM axion BEC can be formed.

For non-thermal axions, the canonical scenario is the axion vacuum misalignment [6, 15, 16] in which case the average axion DM density is given by eq.(10.49) in [6]

$$\rho_{DM} = \rho_{crit}\ 0.13 \times 10^{\pm 0.4}\ \Lambda_{200}^{-0.7}\ F(\bar{\theta}_1)\ \bar{\theta}_1^2\ \left(\frac{m}{10^{-5}\ \mathrm{eV}}\right)^{-1.18} \tag{30}$$

where $\Lambda_{200} \equiv \Lambda_{QCD}/200$ MeV, θ_1 is the value of the axion phase field when axion oscillations begin. Its canonical value is $\theta_1 = \pi/\sqrt{3}$. $F(\bar{\theta}_1)$ accounts for anharmonic effects, $F(\pi/\sqrt{3}) \simeq 1.3$. Eq.(30) yields for the axion mass as $\Omega_{DM} = 0.22$,

$$m = 3.77\ 10^{-5}\ J^{-0.85}\ \mathrm{eV} \quad , \quad J \equiv \frac{3\ \bar{\theta}_1^2\ 10^{\pm 0.4}\ F(\bar{\theta}_1)}{\pi^2\ \Lambda_{200}^{-0.7}\ 1.3} \sim 1\ . \tag{31}$$

Matching eqs.(6)-(7) with eqs.(30)-(31) yields:

$$U\ \left(\frac{T_c}{T_d}\right)^3 = 4.681\ 10^6\ \ \frac{g_d}{25}\ J^{0.85}\ . \tag{32}$$

Eq. (32) and comparison with the thermal case $U^{TE} = 2.404\ldots$ suggest that axions in the vacuum misalignment scenario are strongly out of equilibrium.

Moreover, we can also estimate the phase-space density Q using the DM density and DM velocity estimates from [6] with the result

$$\frac{Q}{\mathrm{keV}^4} = 2.253 \times 10^8\ \Lambda_{200}^{2.59}\ \left(\frac{g_d}{25}\right)^{0.648}\ \left(\frac{\mathrm{eV}}{m}\right)^{1.295}\ .$$

The constraint $Q_{\mathrm{today}} \leq Q$ yields the following upper bound on the axion mass which is easy to fulfil:

$$m \leq 2.818\ \mathrm{MeV}\ \ \Lambda_{200}^2\ \sqrt{\frac{g_d}{25}}\ \left(\frac{\mathrm{keV}^4}{Q_{\mathrm{today}}}\right)^{0.772}$$

We see from eqs.(2) and (31) that the axion mass in the vacuum misalignment scenario is **17 orders of magnitude too large** to reproduce the observed galactic structures.

Present experimental limits leave as available window for the axion mass [2]

$$6 \times 10^{-6}\ \mathrm{eV} < m_a < 2 \times 10^{-3}\ \mathrm{eV}\ . \tag{33}$$

This window **disagrees** by many orders of magnitude both with the galaxy phase-space density constraint eq.(18) and with the Jeans length constraint eq.(1) in order for the axion to be DM. The existence of the axion particle is well motivated from QCD [14, 15]. But, as we see, the axion cannot be the DM particle. The two observable ρ_{DM} and Q robustly constrain T_d/T_c and m in an inescapable way ruling out BEC DM in general and BEC axion DM in particular. Moreover, we have also consider inhomogenous gravitationally bounded BEC's supported by the bosonic quantum pressure independently of any particular particle physics scenario. For a typical size $R \sim$ kpc and compact object masses $M \sim 10^7\ M_\odot$ they remarkably lead to the same particle mass $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV as the BEC free-streaming length. However, the phase-space density for the gravitationally bounded BEC's turns out to be **more than sixty orders of magnitude smaller** than the galaxy observed values.

However, the axion may play a crucial role in cosmology. The observed dark energy density $\rho_\Lambda = (2.35\ \mathrm{meV})^4$ indicates an energy scale in the meV $= 10^{-3}$ eV. This energy value is in the allowed window of axion masses. Therefore, the axion may be the source of the dark energy through the zero point cosmological quantum fluctuations as proposed in ref. [18]. In addition, white dwarf stars observations suggest axions in the range of 2-8 meV [19].

We see indications for an axion mass in the meV range from dwarf stars observations and the dark energy scale. Besides, the misalignment scenario may be able to produce axions with mass in the meV range.

---

[1] W Hu, R Barkana, A Gruzinov, Phys. Rev. Lett, 85, 1158 (2000).

[2] P. Sikivie, Q. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 111301 (2009). O. Erken et al. Phys. Rev. D85, 063520 (2012). P. Sikivie, arXiv:1210.0040.

[3] For a recent reference, see C. Destri, H. J. de Vega, N. G. Sanchez, Phys. Rev. D88, 083512 (2013).
[4] A J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73, 307 (2001). S. Stellmer et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 263003 (2013).
[5] D. Boyanovsky, H. J. de Vega, N. G. Sanchez, arXiv:0710.5180, Phys. Rev. **D 77**, 043518 (2008).
[6] E. W. Kolb, M. S. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley (1990).
[7] S. Tremaine, J. E. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett, 42, 407 (1979).
[8] C. J. Hogan, J. J. Dalcanton, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 063511 (2000). J. J. Dalcanton, C. J. Hogan, Astrophys. J. **561**, 35 (2001).
[9] J. Madsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2744 (1990) and Phys. Rev. **D44**, 999 (1991).
[10] D. Lynden-Bell, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **136**, 101 (1967). S. Tremaine, M. Henon, D. Lynden-Bell, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **219**, 285 (1986). A. Lapi, A. Cavaliere, ApJ 692, 174 (2009).
[11] G. Gilmore et al., Ap J, 663, 948 (2007), M. Walker, J. Peñarrubia, Ap. J. 742, 20 (2011), P. Salucci et al., MNRAS, 378, 41 (2007), H. J. de Vega, P. Salucci, N. G. Sanchez, New Astronomy **17**, 653 (2012), J. D. Simon, M. Geha, Ap J, 670, 313 (2007), J. D. Simon et al., Ap. J. 733, 46 (2011), J. Wolf et al., MNRAS, 406, 1220 (2010), J. P. Brodie et al., AJ, 142, 199 (2011). B. Willman and J. Strader, AJ, 144, 76 (2012), G. D. Martinez et al., Ap J, 738, 55 (2011).
[12] C. Destri, H. J. de Vega, N. G. Sanchez, Astrop. Phys., **46**, 14 (2013).
[13] D. Boyanovsky, C. Destri, H. J. de Vega, Phys. Rev. **D 69**, 045003 (2004). C. Destri, H. J. de Vega, Phys. Rev. **D 73**, 025014 (2006).
[14] R. D. Peccei and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977) 1440 and Phys. Rev. D16 (1977) 1791; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 223; F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 279.
[15] J. Preskill, M. Wise and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B120 (1983) 127; L. Abbott and P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. B120 (1983) 133; M. Dine and W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. B120 (1983) 137.
[16] M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev, D33, 889 (1986).
[17] S. Davidson, M. Elmer, JCAP, 12, 034 (2013).
[18] H. J. de Vega, N. G. Sanchez, astro-ph/0701212.
[19] J. Isern et al. 1992, ApJ 392, L23 and 2008, ApJ 682, L109.